

Montpelier Design Review Committee
Minutes of April 20, 2004
Memorial Room

Members Present: Steve Everett, Chair; Eric Gilbertson, Vicki Lane, Soren Pfeffer, Margot George (arrived at 5:55 p.m.), Stephanie A. Smith, Planner

Others Present: Kenric Kite, ORCA; Tom Quinlan, Quinlan Signs; John Fitzhugh, Union Mutual of Vermont

The meeting was brought to order by Steve Everett, Vice Chair at 5:50 p.m.
There were no comments from the Vice Chair.

Design Review for a Sign Permit - CB-II/DCD

45 Court Street

Applicant: MacLean, Meehan & Rice, LLC

The applicant's representative at the meeting was Tom Quinlan, Quinlan Signs
Two ground signs, 24" x 60", and 8" x 48" within a single 5' tall support system

Tom Quinlan of Quinlan Signs presented the application. The proposed signs are 24" x 60" and a 8" x 48" ground signs within a single support system, constructed of 6" x 6" wood members. The signs are one sided. Mr. Quinlan stated that the ground sign would be set about 3 feet from the edge of the porch. The height of the sign to the top of the decorative balls was 5 feet. The lowest sign would be 30" off the ground. The "Eggleston" sign would be hung from the 6" x 6" cross piece.

Mr. Gilbertson asked if the sign would obscure the porch rail. Mr. Quinlan stated that the sign would be 3' - 4' feet away and it shouldn't obscure the rail. It would be centered within the porch on the west side of the house.

The sign would be 6 feet overall in width including the support structure. Ms. George requested that the Ms. Smith retrieve a sign permit application for 47 Court Street, an adjacent property. The 47 Court Street sign was 2' x 3', and supported by 4" x 4" posts. Ms. George read from the minutes of the review of this sign. Ms. George suggested that the proposed sign should be reduced to be a similar size as the adjacent sign.

Mr. Quinlan stated that he cannot reduce the size of the sign because he is accommodating two businesses within the sign structure, unlike the sign at 47 Court Street, which was for a single business. He also stated that he was within the maximum sign limits for the zoning district.

Ms. George commented she thought the sign was too large. The wood members which support the sign are proposed as 6" x 6"s, and thought these elements were too large. Mr. Quinlan suggested that he could reduce the size of the support members to 4" x 4"s similar to the adjacent sign at 47 Court Street..

Ms. Smith asked the heights of the letters. Mr. Quinlan stated that the "M" in MacLean was 5" tall. The other letters were 3" tall.

Mr. Gilbertson stated that the sign was too wide and that it may visually overcome the historic building.

Ms. George stated she thought the sign was too large in general. Ms. Lane concurred and questioned the color choice.

Mr. Quinlan stated that color choice was a big part of the design of the sign, and that the color choice was not a rash decision.

Mr. Pfeffer also thought the sign was too big, but that he agreed with the reduction in the size of the support members and encouraged Mr. Quinlan to locate the sign as close to the house as possible, but not obscure the porch rail and corner support when viewed from the road.

Mr. Everett thought the sign should be smaller.

Ms. George reviewed the criteria.

(Please refer to the recommendation form signed by the Chair)

The Design Review Committee recommend approval of the sign as with the following adjustments 5/0.

Design Review for a Sign Permit - CB-I/DCD

89 Main Street, City Center

Applicant: John Miller, Sign Designs; however, the application was presented by Kenric Kite, of ORCA.

Mr. Kite presented that application for two 2' x 6' wall signs within the sign band at City Center. One is proposed on the Main Street side, the other on the East State Street side of the building.

Mr. Kite explained that a shift in signs will have to occur to allow for their sign to placed within the sign band at an even interval with the existing signs on the Main Street side of the building.

Ms. George reviewed the criteria.

(Please refer to the recommendation form signed by the Chair)

Design Review - CIV/DCD- continued from the April 6, 2004 DRC meeting

139 State Street

Applicant: Union Mutual of Vermont, represented by John Fitzhugh

Mr. Fitzhugh presented the application to the committee. He explained that they had received constructive comments at the 4/6/04 DRC meeting. Last week they went before the Capitol

Complex Commission and received approval for the plan that is before the committee today. They propose to locate the emergency generator to the northeast corner of their parking lot. They plan to install a hospital grade sound attenuating muffler over the generator. The total height of the enclosure is 129", and the fuel tank will be within the enclosure.

Mr. Gilberston suggested that the applicant install a evergreen plant material to screen the generator.

Ms. George reviewed the Design Review Criteria.
(Please refer to the recommendation form)

Ms. Smith had an item that she wanted to discuss under other business. Mr. Hitzig can before the DRC this past winter to discuss exterior changes to the property located at 154 Main Street. He had received approval for painting this property 3 different colors. He has since discovered that he would like to change some of the trim colors. The body is remaining the same color as originally approved. Ms. Smith said that she thought this could be considered a minor change exempt from DRC review, because it is only the secondary colors that are changing, and the proposed change is in paint color is the choice in intensity of colors. The DRC agreed that the change was minor, and suggested that like changes to previously approved paint colors would be exempt from Design Review.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.